

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF RAFINESQUE,  
1822, "ON THE TURTLES OF THE UNITED STATES".

Z.N.(S.) 2289

(see vol. 37, pp. 53-56)

(i) by L.B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie,  
Leiden, Netherlands*)

So far as I can see, only *Trionyx nasica* (of which an objective character, viz., 'the weight of fifty pounds' is given) and *Monoclista kentukensis* (of which a good description is provided) are available names. The other ten names are nomina nuda, as, according to Article 16b(i), a vernacular name does not constitute an indication. It will thus be sufficient to suppress only the name *Trionyx nasica*. The generic name *Monoclista* is a junior synonym of *Terrapene* Merrem, 1820, and does not do any harm, and likewise the specific name *kentukensis* is a junior synonym of *carolina* Linnaeus, 1758.

(ii) reply by H.M. Smith

The Code as at present constituted, Art. 16b(i), does indeed eliminate a vernacular name as an indication, in the sense of Art. 12. The same provision is maintained in the proposed revision of the Code. Hence, only *Monoclista*, *M. kentukensis* and *Trionyx nasica*, of the names used in Rafinesque's work, can be regarded as occupied as of that work since all others were accompanied only by vernacular names. Furthermore, of those three names, only *T. nasica* is a senior synonym of a currently accepted name, *T. spiniferus* (Le Sueur, 1827); of the other two, *Monoclista* is a synonym of *Terrapene* Merrem, 1820, and *M. kentukensis* is a synonym of *T. carolina carolina* Linnaeus, 1758) and neither is likely to cause confusion. Therefore suppression only of *T. nasica* would suffice to eliminate the actual nomenclatural confusion that would result from application of the Law of Priority to Rafinesque's 1822 work.

The view has long been expounded by one of us (H.M.S.), however, that when either the scientific or the vernacular name provides descriptive information (i.e. not simply locality, geological horizon, host, specimen number or label, or synonymic allocation as cited in Art. 16b), the requirement for an 'indication' in the sense of Art. 12 is met.

Should that view ever be adopted in the Code, it would be useful for Rafinesque's entire work of 1822, not simply the name *T. nasica*, to have been suppressed. Otherwise the latter option would be the simplest to effect nomenclatural stability.

(iii) by A.F. Stimson (*British Museum, Natural History*)

It is clear that *Trionyx nasica* should be suppressed, either by suppressing that name alone, or by suppressing the whole of Rafinesque's 1822 paper.

Which course is taken must depend on whether or not the other names are considered nomina nuda. I agree with Hobart Smith that such a term as 'Dwarf soft-shelled turtle', while evidently a vernacular, is also sufficiently descriptive to identify the species and may be regarded as a brief description.

Art. 12 requires that to be available a name must be accompanied by a description, definition or indication. Art. 16b(i) states that a vernacular name does

not constitute an indication. Nowhere does it say that a vernacular name cannot constitute a description. Thus I support the original proposal to suppress Rafinesque's 1822 work.

COMMENT ON PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF ARTEMIA LEACH,  
1819  
(CRUSTACEA, BRANCHIOPODA). Z.N.(S.) 1984  
see vol. 37: 223-227

By L.B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie,  
Leiden, Netherlands*)

I will gladly support Dr Lochhead's application to conserve the generic name *Artemia* Leach, 1819. There are, however, two minor points that I want to make.

1. Mathews (1911, *Novitates Zoologicae*, vol. 18(1), p. 18) noted that the four volumes of the first edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal* were published 7 December 1816, not in 1817 as mentioned on the title page. The date of *Artemisia* Latreille is thus 1816 (in Cuvier, *Règne Anim.* (ed. 1), vol. 3, p. 68).

2. The first type designation for the genus *Artemia* Leach that I know of is by Lucas (1840, *Histoire naturelle des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Myriapodes*, p. 289), where under *Artemia salina* the author remarked: "L'espèce qui a servi de type à ce genre est un petit Crustacé...." The same remark can be found on the same page in the 1842 and 1851 issues of the work.

[Editor's note. Dr Lochhead has written to say he is grateful for these comments: the corrections will be taken into account when the voting paper is issued.]

COMMENT ON A REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN ARTICLE 40 OF THE  
CODE. Z.N.(S.)2250

By Walter O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, Private Bag,  
Auckland, 1., New Zealand*)

I fully support Dr. Pettibone's application (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p.7) for a change in Article 40 of the Code. This article does not serve any useful purpose other than to cloud the issue and lose sight of the true relationship and meaning of the family-group name in cases where the type genus has disappeared in synonymy.

Article 40 is not only a source of confusion in Polychaeta but is also irritatingly present in Mollusca. An example is the current family-group name CYLINDROMITRINAE Cossmann, 1899, which is protected under Article 40 and must be given chronological priority over PTERYGIINAE Kuroda, 1934, even though its type genus *Cylindromitra* Fischer, 1884, has long ago disappeared in the synonymy of *Pterygia* Röding, 1798.

Article 40 contributes very little to nomenclatural stability and should be either emended or even deleted from the Code.